



Comisiwn Ffiniau
Llywodraeth Leol
i Gymru



Local Government
Boundary Commission
for Wales

The 2009 Workshops – Some Feedback and Analysis

Local Government Boundary Commission for Wales

June 2010

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

Comisiwn Ffiniau
Llywodraeth Leol
i Gymru



Local Government
Boundary Commission
for Wales

2010

Chair **Mr P J Wood**

Deputy Chair **Rev. Hywel Meredydd Davies BD**

Member **Mr D J Bader**



WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	7
A Guide to the Feedback	9
The Key Issues Identified	9
Workshop1 : 17 th October 2009: <i>Glyndwr University Wrexham</i>	11
Workshop 2 : 24 th November 2009: <i>Brangwyn Hall Swansea</i>	16
Workshop 3: 16 th December 2009: <i>Orbit Business Centre, Merthyr Tydfil</i>	20
List of Attendees at the Workshops	25

Introduction

Following the completion of the workshops in December 2009, it was agreed that an analysis of the feedback gathered would go back to attendees so that there was a record of the discussions. We are grateful to the 80 people who participated in these workshops and shared their thoughts and views with us.

This work has now been completed and we have been able to draw together the key issues from the important points highlighted from each workshop. On occasions some erroneous assumptions were recorded during the workshops by the participants. We have kept these in this as it will be necessary to address these issues in some way. Where these exist, a comment in brackets has been added to help in following the document.

We are now in the process of publishing our Strategic Plan on our website for all to see.

Paul Wood
Chairman





Wrexham...



... Swansea.

A Guide to the Feedback

At the commencement of each Workshop each Delegate was advised that the topic was the Commission's "STRATEGIC PLAN" which can be seen on the Commission's website. In this document, which was circulated, there was a description of how the Commission were looking forward to the priorities over the next few years. The Commission wanted to gather the delegates views on our proposals. We also provided during each workshop, an update on the current Electoral Reviews of Unitary Authorities and gave some feedback from last year's workshop.

The workshops were focussed on three areas of questions:

- ***What are the strong and weak points of the Commissions Strategic Plan?***
- ***What are the key issues in the Commission's Strategic Plan for your Authority?***
- ***What are your general views on the Commission's performance?***

During each workshop, the delegates were divided into groups (Tables) and were asked by the Facilitator to focus on the suggested questions and for each group to record their answers on a flip chart.

Once the discussions had been concluded, each individual on the Table was asked to "vote" for what they considered to be the top issue and were given some coloured stars to fix on to the flip chart so that the votes could be counted.

The following analysis provides a record of the discussions through the key points identified on the flip charts, together with the number of "votes" the various issues attracted.

Finally a summary is provided for each Workshop.

The Key Issues Identified

Below is a summary of the comments that received the most votes across all the tables at all three workshops:

- Participants recommended close working between boundary Commission and electoral Commission in other words, link LGBCW reviews to other reviews to promote discussion on all boundary issues [It appears that the parliamentary activities are insufficiently clear to some participants. There may also be some confusion with the work and function of the Electoral Commission]
- Communication and consultation perceived as very important, particularly how to engage the public
- Community councillors generally said they had not had enough time or meetings to involve themselves and their stakeholders on the proposed changes

- A publicised timetable of the Commission's plans well in advance would help, together with simple guidance
- Does the 1;1,750 ratio take Councillor workloads; rurality, moving populations, (such as students, holiday homes), different county and community boundaries into account [There is an issue surrounding the legal requirement to focus on electors rather than population]
- How does the presence or not of community councillors in a locality affect the work load of county councillors
- Single member wards are preferred as they are prone to less political infighting and can be more effective
- Some doubts expressed about the independence of the Commission from WAG
- LGBCW work programme should be available for performance review of quantitative targets

Outcomes

As a result of our consultation we have adopted the following actions:

- Published this feedback to all who participated in the consultation Workshops in 2009
- On consultation and communication, we have used the national media to try to publicise the electoral reviews and have undertaken a lengthy series of presentations to Unitary Authorities and groups of Community Councils. Where requested, we have also met with group leaders.
- Commissioners undertake Site Visits to look directly at the areas being reviewed
- Close attention paid to historical and cultural issues, but not excluding other factors in the law such as parity of voters
- Recognising the different needs of rural and urban areas in our Electoral Reviews.
- We have made an initial approach to the Electoral Commission and we would like to look at some issues with them. This will be further explored after the current round of electoral reviews.
- On timescales, we have been flexible where reasoned arguments for extensions have been put forward but we have had to balance this with the need to make timely progress.
- On independence, our reports continue to reflect the fact that the Commission, whilst welcoming criticism, challenge and dialogue from the political community, comes to its own conclusions after weighing the evidence presented.

Wrexham

**Workshop 1 - 17th October 2009:
Glyndwr University Wrexham**

**What are the strong and weak points of
the Commission's Strategic Plan?**

Table 1

Weak points

- ◆ Town and community councils building blocks, the foundations are wrong so the structure falls down
- ◆ Need a bottom up approach *
- ◆ Communications **
- ◆ Variables in finalising boundaries
- ◆ Weighting re; demographics, geography not known in advance need guidelines *
- ◆ Consistency in decision making
- ◆ Work in partnership para should include town and community councils ***
- ◆ Councillor workloads *****

Table 2

Weak points

- ◆ Reference 'implementing WAG policies' conflicts with independence of Commission. **
- ◆ Substance of plan, not enough detail

Strong points

- ◆ Well meant intentions
- ◆ Not too lengthy
- ◆ Consultation is well structured

Table 3

Weak points

- ◆ Doesn't make clear what end result should be and what it wants to do
- ◆ Objectives unclear
- ◆ Need to be clear operational plans to deliver the aspiration elements *
- ◆ Does reference to a particular political policy undermine independence ***

Strong points

- ◆ Clear statement of purpose
- ◆ Strategy is well structured

Table 4

- ◆ What is the Commission's plan if the 'One Wales' coalition fails *
- ◆ Proper consultation difficulties (in laymen's language) **
- ◆ Not enough guidance on rurality and how to take it into account **

What are the strong and weak points of the Commission's Strategic Plan?

Table 5

- ◆ Need capability to question rules *
- ◆ Need to be able to review all levels of boundaries in one go - from the 'bottom up' ****
- ◆ Need close working between Boundary Commission and Electoral Commission ***
- ◆ Lots of references to WAG – questions independence
- ◆ Should Commission be asked to review complete local and national government?

Table 6*Weak points*

- ◆ Plan appears reactive *
- ◆ No obvious link with Electoral Commission **
- ◆ Some inconsistency of language i.e. unitary, council, citizen, public
- ◆ Number points / pages
- ◆ Email link for communication (innovative use?)
- ◆ Reference to 'One Wales' is too specific

Strong points

- ◆ It exists
- ◆ Succinct
- ◆ Stakeholder consultation

What are the key issues in the Commission's Strategic Plan for your Authority?

Table 1

- ◆ Unitary authority finance for effective consultation
- ◆ Date of report release exclude August and Christmas *
- ◆ 6 week period too low, need rural weighting for positive participation
- ◆ Town and Community councils
- ◆ Finance – notification of review notified before precept set in Jan *
- ◆ Communication and consultation *
- ◆ Are numbers of community councillors right?
- ◆ Are numbers of boundaries right? *

Table 2

- ◆ Rural communities/areas – representation levels need to decide on guidance **
- ◆ Coordinated reviews at the same time parliamentary / CB/ community, not just number of electors relevant **
- ◆ Electoral reviews currently taking place are concern at the moment
- ◆ Development of relationships with stake holders *
- ◆ Student residential areas affect electorate levels
- ◆ How to engage effectively with the public on the key issues *

What are the key issues in the Commission's Strategic Plan for your Authority?

Table 3

- ◆ Progress of review
- ◆ Will the timetable allow full consultation and response with all interested parties?
- ◆ How will the public be engaged *
- ◆ Detail lost in broader picture
- ◆ Practicalities of delivering the strategy *
- ◆ Is 1:1,750 ratio flexible enough in large wards **

Table 4

- ◆ Strategic guidance from the minister aiming for ratio of 1 councillor to 1,750 voters
- ◆ How can consultation be effective reaching and engaging the voters about boundary changes and ethos?
- ◆ Great deal of discussion about unregistered transient populations particularly 'holiday caravan areas'
- ◆ Matching wards to perceived communities **

Table 5

- ◆ Outsiders making local decisions
- ◆ Commission restricted by rules set by WAG give independence doubts **
- ◆ Worried that local suggestions are being ignored
- ◆ Natural rural communities limited sizes *
- ◆ 1: 1,750 difficulty in achieving this with building blocks
- ◆ Dilution of welsh culture *
- ◆ Inconsistency with parliamentary constituencies
- ◆ Transient population
- ◆ Census vs. electoral role
- ◆ Disillusion with politics
- ◆ Rural vs. built-up wards within same county

Table 6

- ◆ Boundary review
- ◆ County community not coterminous should not be split ****
- ◆ Full consultation identify all stakeholders
- ◆ Community council preference for community cohesion to take priority
- ◆ Close link with Electoral Commission on activity *
- ◆ Support reputation of Commission as confident, authoritative, respected and partner in Welsh public policy
- ◆ Independence of Commission is welcomed but small risk of compromise perceived

What are your general views on the Commission's performance?

Table 1

- ◆ Unable to comment due to lack of information e.g. formal feedback from last year's OAGM and action taken

What are your general views on the Commission's performance?

Table 2

- ◆ Broadly satisfied
- ◆ Commission's work completed effectively and timely
- ◆ Seems to be delay within WAG getting necessary legislation in place correctly
- ◆ Communication important at all levels including community level

Table 3*Weak points*

- ◆ Clarification of roles in the process is required – some operational confusion ***
- ◆ System failed which led to dissatisfaction that an objective was not properly considered *
- ◆ Reports could be clearer

Strong points

- ◆ Staff approachable, knowledgeable, helpful and professional
- ◆ Open and prepared to listen

Table 4

- ◆ How can the Commission work in isolation from the Electoral Commission **
- ◆ Why have a separate parliamentary Boundary Commission
- ◆ Perceive the Commission to be caught between assembly demands and local council needs and accountability to their electorate **

Table 5

No comments

Table 6

- ◆ What information do we use to assess performance (this may be influenced by personal perception)
- ◆ Always a professional approach, based on personal contact
- ◆ Commission work programme should be available for performance review of quantitative targets ****

Summary of votes**One vote****One
Vote**

- Need a bottom up approach *
- Weighting re; demographics, geography not known in advance need guidelines *
- Need to be clear operational plans to deliver the aspiration elements *
- What is the Commission's plan if the 'One Wales' coalition fails *
- Need capability to question rules *
- Plan appears reactive *
- Date of report release exclude August and Christmas *

- ↪ Finance – notification of review notified before precept set in Jan *
- ↪ Communication and consultation *
- ↪ Are numbers of boundaries right? *
- ↪ Development of relationships with stake holders *
- ↪ How to engage effectively with the public on the key issues *
- ↪ How will the public be engaged *
- ↪ Practicalities of delivering the strategy *
- ↪ Natural rural communities limited sizes *
- ↪ Dilution of welsh culture *
- ↪ Close link with Electoral Commission on activity *
- ↪ System failed which led to dissatisfaction that an objective was not properly considered *

Two votes

- ↪ Communications **
- ↪ Reference 'implementing WAG policies' conflicts with independence of Commission. **
- ↪ Proper consultation difficulties (in laymen's language) **
- ↪ Not enough guidance on rurality and how to take it into account **
- ↪ No obvious link with Electoral Commission **
- ↪ Rural communities/areas – representation levels need to decide on guidance **
- ↪ Coordinated reviews at the same time parliamentary/ CB/ community, not just number of electors relevant **
- ↪ Is 1:1,750 ratio flexible enough in large wards **
- ↪ Matching wards to perceived communities **
- ↪ Commission restricted by rules set by WAG give independence doubts **
- ↪ How can the Commission work in isolation from the Electoral Commission **
- ↪ Perceive the Commission to be caught between assembly demands and local council needs and accountability to their electorate **

Two
Votes

Three votes

- ↪ Work in partnership para should include town and community councils ***
- ↪ Does reference to a particular political policy undermine independence ***
- ↪ Need close working between boundary Commission and Electoral Commission ***
- ↪ Clarification of roles in process is required – some operational confusion ***

Three
Votes

Four or more votes

- ↪ Councillor workloads *****
- ↪ Need to be able to review all levels of boundaries in one go 'bottom up' *****
- ↪ Boundary review; County / community not coterminous should not be split *****
- ↪ Commission work programme should be available for performance review of quantitative targets *****

Four or
more
Votes

In summary, these are the comments that had the most votes across all the tables;

- Need close working between Boundary Commission and Electoral Commission - Communication and consultation perceived as very important, particularly how to engage the public
- Some doubts expressed about the independence of the Commission from WAG
- Councillor workloads and the flexibility, or not, of the 1:1,750 ratio taking rurality, different county and community boundaries into account
- This situation might be resolved more easily if the LGBCW work could be linked to the Electoral Commission [Issue of understanding of the roles of the different organisations]
- LGBCW work programme should be available for performance review of quantitative targets

~~~~~

**Workshop 2: 24<sup>th</sup> November 2009: Brangwyn Hall Swansea**

**Swansea**

**What are the strong and weak points of the Commission's Strategic Plan?**

*What are the strong and weak points of the Commission's Strategic Plan?*

**Table 1**

*Weak points*

- ◆ Not named on strategic plan
- ◆ Waffle – simple language
- ◆ Avoid jargon
- ◆ Consultation period too short for LAs
- ◆ Need timeline for whole review

*Strong points*

- ◆ Short
- ◆ Opened debate

**Table 3**

*Weak points*

- ◆ Inadequate funding to communicate with the public
- ◆ Statutory powers should be given to the Commission
- ◆ Electoral reviews should be more frequent than every 15 years \*\*

*Strong points*

- ◆ Equitable representation and fairness
- ◆ Draft proposals more than adequate response time
- ◆ Website
- ◆ Commission is more impartial – should do reviews rather than principal LAs. \*\*\*\*

**Table 4**

- ◆ Why review every 10/15 years? Communities evolve slowly, don't review for the sake of it
- ◆ Might reduction in councillors encourage more rural planning approvals?
- ◆ Basing reviews on electoral register ignores non registered
- ◆ Draft proposals are a strength (to promote comment) \*
- ◆ Single member wards preferred wherever possible \*\*\*\*

**Table 6**

- ◆ Multi wards - impossible to manage constituency affairs – political parties; councillor capabilities; public seek help from all councillors (their right) or the perceived 'best' councillor
- ◆ Benefits are not practically achievable, political point scoring

**What are the key issues in the Commission's Strategic Plan for your Authority?**

**Table 1**

- ◆ Corporate memory, length of time, training for dummies
- ◆ Large multi member divisions confuse voters (4+ confuse, 2 to 3 is good) this would work with regional councillor \*\*\*\*\*
- ◆ Convenient and effective local government, what does it actually mean?
- ◆ Should be full time continuous process
- ◆ Should 1:1,750 be based on population not electorate?
- ◆ Regional councillor like WAG

**Table 3**

- ◆ Strategic plan is only relevant when reviews process is underway
- ◆ Commission need to be more aware of communities they are reviewing \*
- ◆ Commission should be able to move areas into other areas they feel more compatible with \*\*

**Table 4**

- ◆ Areas with older housing place more work on councillors (new housing occupiers go straight to officers)  
Is 1:1,750 sacrosanct? \*
- ◆ How does county councillor workload vary between Neath area (with community councils) and Port Talbot (without) \*\*\*\*

**Table 6**

- ◆ Boundaries, changes are not considered sensible by communities
- ◆ Focus of communities may be split e.g. Powys/ Ystradgynlais/ Swansea
- ◆ Must identify 'community', may not be shared by multi member representative but may represent community groups
- ◆ Value of community boundaries
- ◆ Power of community councils needs strengthening – money follows power
- ◆ Commission limited by statutory powers, expectations of all tiers, cost implications
- ◆ Ratio of councillors is of concern especially in rural areas

*What are  
The key is-  
sues in the  
Commission's  
Strategic Plan  
for your  
Authority?*

*What are your general views on the Commission's performance?*

### **What are your general views on the Commission's performance?**

#### **Table 1**

- ◆ Not clear what can be done under which review (elec.comm.v.good)
- ◆ Corporate memory
- ◆ Boundary Commission need training for dummies \*\*\*\*\*
- ◆ Roll all reviews into one, this will allow all boundary issues to be discussed at same time \*\*\*\*\*

#### **Table 3**

- ◆ Improve communication \*\*\*
- ◆ Not enough funding/ staff \*
- ◆ Greater knowledge of areas \*
- ◆ Commission have a difficult job, rock and a hard place
- ◆ All reviews done at same time – too many reviews \*

#### **Table 4**

- ◆ Not read in advance – difficult to grasp!
- ◆ Lack of balanced representation in Powys therefore review is necessary to correct this
- ◆ Groundwork not always evident
- ◆ Sense of community is key to well being
- ◆ Recognise one communities good decisions is another ones bad
- ◆ Ensure no undue political influence
- ◆ Highlight examples of how Commission changes initial proposals to reflect local views \*\*\*\*\*
- ◆ Is there an agenda to cut county councillors beyond this review?

#### **Table 5**

No comments

#### **Table 6**

- ◆ Timescale for response does not really give enough time e.g. recess
- ◆ LGBCW need to publicise its powers widely
- ◆ Need to ensure all tiers get the same information – LGBCW to notify community councils of proposals and arrange separate meetings for communities \*\*\*\*
- ◆ Have sufficient meetings to reach all community councils \*\*\*\*
- ◆ Try to find ways to emphasise the importance of the review to stakeholders especially community councillors \*\*\*\*
- ◆ Publicise timetable well in advance so community councils can arrange business \*\*\*
- ◆ Review should be every 7 years
- ◆ Uniform review process for all tiers

## Summary of votes

### **One vote**

- ↪ Draft proposals are a strength (to promote comment) \*
- ↪ Commission need to be more aware of communities they are reviewing \*
- ↪ Is 1:1,750 sacrosanct? \*

**One  
Vote**

### **Two and three votes**

- ↪ Electoral reviews should be more frequent than every 15 years \*\*
- ↪ Commission should be able to move areas into other areas they feel more compatible with \*\*
- ↪ Improve communication \*\*\*
- ↪ Publicise timetable well in advance so community councils can arrange business \*\*\*

**Two  
and  
Three  
Votes**

### **Four or more votes**

- ↪ Commission is more impartial – should do reviews rather than principal LAs. \*\*\*\*
- ↪ Single member wards preferred wherever possible \*\*\*\*
- ↪ Large multi member (divisions confuse voters (4+ confuse, 2 to 3 is good) this would work with regional councillor \*\*\*\*\*
- ↪ How does county councillor workload vary between Neath area (with community councils) and Port Talbot (without) \*\*\*\*\*
- ↪ Boundary Commission need training for dummies \*\*\*\*\*
- ↪ Role all reviews into one, this will allow all boundary issues to be discussed at same time \*\*\*\*\*
- ↪ Highlight examples of how Commission changes initial proposals to reflect local views \*\*\*\*\*
- ↪ Need to ensure all tiers get the same information – LGBCW to notify community councils of proposals and arrange separate meetings for communities \*\*\*\*\*
- ↪ Have sufficient meetings to reach all community councils \*\*\*\*\*
- ↪ Try to find ways to emphasise the importance of the review to stakeholders especially community councillors \*\*\*\*\*

**Four or  
more  
Votes**

In summary, these are the comments that had the most votes across all the tables;

- Community councillors seen as not having enough time or meetings to involve themselves and their stakeholders on the proposed changes
- A publicised timetable well in advance would help together with simple guidance
- How does the presence or not of community councillors affect the work load of county councillors
- Single member wards are preferred
- Link LGBCW reviews to other reviews to promote discussion on all boundary issues

**Merthyr  
Tydfil**

What are the strong and weak points of the Commission's Strategic Plan?

~~~~~

**Workshop 3: 16th December 2009:
Orbit Business Centre, Merthyr Tydfil**

What are the strong and weak points of the Commission's Strategic Plan?

Table 1

Weak points

- ◆ Need strategy document before meeting
- ◆ Cannot move boundaries **
- ◆ List of actions / targets / timescales needed *
- ◆ Strategy too wordy
- ◆ More regular feedback required

Strong points

- ◆ Boundary Commission members independent

Table 2

- ◆ Not been given notice of the strategic plan before hand **
- ◆ LGBC need to be more proactive
- ◆ Community reviews needed to be more robust
- ◆ Lack of local knowledge means that boundaries of new divisions do not make sense to the electorate ****
- ◆ Core business should be their purpose – disjointed, should not be led by WAG (independence)
- ◆ Strategy has no clear theme
- ◆ Concentrate on core business of form and shape of LG
- ◆ Time and resources limited – if this process so fundamental to democracy why has it not been given sufficient time or taken seriously **
- ◆ Lack of transparency of final decisions get stakeholders more involved in some way *
- ◆ Gap in powers – consider local petitions / local identity *
- ◆ Lack of confidence in reviews so far *****
- ◆ Bottom up approach problematic

Table 4

- ◆ Independence
- ◆ Too wordy and repetitive
- ◆ How will they go about achieving the objectives?
- ◆ Define stakeholders and partners **
- ◆ Strategy not a plan, need more milestones ***
- ◆ Detail on being an employer should be included in operational plan not strategic plan
- ◆ Visions about here and now not about where the Commission will be in a few years ***

Table 5*Weak points*

- ◆ Not clear, words used can be interpreted differently e.g. boundary review / electoral arrangements
- ◆ Timeline is not clear
- ◆ Brief is not clear, not wide ranging enough ***

Strong points

- ◆ Clear strategic plan, constraints political influence ****
- ◆ Size of the Commission and number of Qs the plan is asking is a strength – too many words suggest it would become a talking shop

**What are the key issues in the Commission's
Strategic Plan for your Authority?**

Table 1

- ◆ Explain ability of LAs to review/ change boundaries and polling districts
- ◆ One body to review all boundaries **
- ◆ Need set up of whole boundary system explained from parliamentary down to community – understand the building blocks **
- ◆ Who is responsible for what (boundaries)?
- ◆ System needs to be simple!

Table 4

- ◆ Engagement in consultation
- ◆ Actions impact not the plan
- ◆ Equality of representation ***

Table 5

- ◆ Need to be alert to issues of multi member words; political fighting, practical effectiveness ****
- ◆ Shaping informing electorate, elected members will by definition have a vested interest
- ◆ What might make the best use of public resource in one county might not be right for another. One solution does not fit all.
- ◆ Unclear how much consideration is given to individual needs/ workloads / rurality / sparsity of different counties *
- ◆ Timeline of review e.g. in Powys we are facing a huge issue with possibly merging the health board and changing boundaries etc right now might be a change too much
- ◆ Need to acknowledge we as councillors know our authorities best, maybe we should be making the proposals rather than having changes suggested/ imposed

What are the key issues in the Commission's Strategic Plan for your Authority?

What are your general views on the Commission's performance?

What are your general views on the Commission's performance?

Table 1

- ◆ Give LAs time limit to review wards
- ◆ Who would do review of communities? LA? Political? Independent?
- ◆ Discussion on electoral roll vs. Population ****
- ◆ Who can initiate a review?
- ◆ Need local input *

Table 4

- ◆ We do not know enough about this – how would we know? ****
- ◆ Poor communication e.g. the 1: 1,750 issue
- ◆ Breadth of remit = confusion + work on time

Summary of votes

One Vote

One vote

- List of actions / targets / timescales needed *
- Lack of transparency of final decisions get stakeholders more involved in some way *
- Gap in powers – consider local petitions / local identity *
- Unclear how much consideration is given to individual needs / workloads / rurality / sparsity of different counties *
- Need local input *

Two and Three Votes

Two and three votes

- Cannot move boundaries **
- Not been given notice of the strategic plan before hand **
- Time and resources limited – if this process so fundamental to democracy why has it not been given sufficient time or taken seriously **
- Define stakeholders and partners **
- One body to review all boundaries **
- Need set up of whole boundary system explained from parliamentary down to community – understand the building blocks **
- Strategy not a plan, need more milestones ***
- Visions about here and now not about where the Commission will be in a few years ***
- Brief is not clear, not wide ranging enough ***
- Equality of representation ***

Four or more Votes

Four or more votes

- Lack of local knowledge means that boundaries of new divisions do not make sense to the electorate ****
- Lack of confidence in reviews so far *****
- Clear strategic plan, constrains political influence ****

- ↪ Need to be alert to issues of multi member wards; political fighting, practical effectiveness ****
- ↪ Discussion on electoral roll vs. Population ****
- ↪ We do not know enough about this – how would we know? ****

In summary, these are the comments that had the most votes across all the tables;

- ◆ Lack of local knowledge means that boundaries of new divisions do not make sense to the electorate
- ◆ There is a perceived lack of confidence in the reviews so far, one body is needed to review all boundaries
- ◆ Single member wards have less political in fighting and can be more effective
- ◆ Strategy is not wide ranging enough

Workshop Feedback

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR WALES ANNUAL REPORT & WORKSHOPS 2009

Cllr Marc Jones	<i>(On behalf of Janet Ryder AM/AC) Wrexham CBC Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Wrecsam</i>
Trevor Coxon	<i>Wrexham County Borough Council Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Wrecsam</i>
Cllr Bob Barton	<i>Denbighshire County Council Cyngor Sir Ddinbych</i>
Cllr David Evans	<i>Shotton Town Council Cyngor Tref Shotton</i>
Cllr Phillip Evans	<i>Conwy County Borough Council Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Conwy</i>
Cllr Jason Weyman	<i>Conwy County Borough Council Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Conwy</i>
Cllr Andrew Hinchcliff	<i>Conwy County Borough Council Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Conwy</i>
Raymond Smith	<i>Chirk Town Council Cyngor Tref Chirk</i>
Iwan Davies	<i>Conwy County Borough Council Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Conwy</i>
Cllr Huw Jones	<i>Denbighshire County Council Cyngor Sir Ddinbych</i>
Gwynda Morris	<i>Denbighshire County Council Cyngor Sir Ddinbych</i>
Frank Cuthbert	<i>LGP - Welsh Assembly Government LGP – Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru</i>
Mike Vickers	<i>Assistant to Lesley Griffiths, AM</i>
Gareth Evans	<i>Denbighshire County Council Cyngor Sir Ddinbych</i>
Graham Nelmes	<i>Minera Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Minera</i>
Cllr Mike Pugh	<i>Llangollen Town Mayor Maer, Tref Llangollen</i>
Jayne Moss	<i>Flintshire County Council Cyngor Sir Fflint</i>
Graham Connah	<i>Flintshire County Council Cyngor Sir Fflint</i>
Cllr N Phillips	<i>Flintshire County Council Cyngor Sir Fflint</i>
David E Jones	<i>Llanferres Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Llanferres</i>
Cllr P J Curtis	<i>Holywell Town Council Cyngor Tref Caergybi</i>

Wrexham

07/ 10/ 2009

34 Attendees

Wrexham (cont.) 07/ 10/ 2009	<p>Cllr J Griffiths</p> <p>Gaynor Coventry</p> <p>Cllr Peter Harris</p> <p>Cllr Bryan Grew</p> <p>Alan Williams</p> <p>Alwyn Jones-Parry</p> <p>Huw Jones</p> <p>Cefyn Williams</p> <p>Mr Leffert Jonkman</p> <p>Godfrey D Northam</p> <p>J G Beard</p> <p>Mr C Rhodes</p> <p>Nick Bardsley</p>	<p><i>Holywell Town Council</i> <i>Cyngor Tref Caergybi</i></p> <p><i>Wrexham County Borough Council</i> <i>Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Wreccsam</i></p> <p><i>Powys County Council</i> <i>Cyngor Sir Powys</i></p> <p><i>One Voice Wales</i> <i>Un Llais Cymru</i></p> <p><i>Isle of Anglesey County Council</i> <i>Cyngor Sir Ynys Mon</i></p> <p><i>Cynwyd Community Council</i> <i>Cyngor Cymuned Cynwyd</i></p> <p><i>Corwen Community Council</i> <i>Cyngor Cymuned Corwen</i></p> <p><i>Cynwyd Community Council</i> <i>Cyngor Cymuned Cynwyd</i></p> <p><i>Esclusham Community Council</i> <i>Cyngor Cymuned Esclusham</i></p>
Swansea 24 /11/ 2009 23 Attendees	<p>Huw G Evans</p> <p>Amanda Bebb</p> <p>Cllr Elfyn Williams</p> <p>Simon White</p> <p>J Jowett</p> <p>Mr Rhys J George</p> <p>Amy Edwards</p> <p>Phil Allen</p> <p>Cllr Susan McNicholas</p> <p>Cllr John Steadman</p>	<p>Democratic Services and Complaints Manager, City & County of Swansea Rheolwr Gwasanaethau Democraidd a Chwynion Dinas a Sir Abertawe</p> <p>City & County of Swansea Dinas a Sir Abertawe</p> <p>Llandyfaelog Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Llandyfaelog</p> <p>One Voice Wales Un Llais Cymru</p> <p>Clerk - Brackla Community Council Clerc – Cyngor Cymuned Bracla</p> <p>Electoral Services Manager Neath Port Talbot CBC</p> <p>Welsh Assembly Government Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru</p> <p>Ordnance Survey</p> <p>Powys County Council Cyngor Sir Powys</p> <p>Powys County Council Cyngor Sir Powys</p>

Swansea
(cont.)
24 /11/ 2009

Cllr Robert Power	Crynant Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Creunant
Cllr Tony Berrow	Laleston Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Trelales
Cllr S Aspey	Porthcawl Town Council Cyngor Tref Porthcawl
Cllr Graham Davies	Ystradgynlais Town Council Cyngor Tref Ystradgynlais
Cllr R V Smith	Llwchwr Town Council Cyngor Trêf Llwwchwr
Cllr D A Evans	Llwchwr Town Council Cyngor Trêf Llwwchwr
Chris Roberts	Welsh Labour Llafur Cymru
Cllr Lilian Pritchard	Mumbles Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Y Mwmbwls
Cllr John Cooper	Mumbles Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Y Mwmbwls
Cllr Mike Richards	Blaenhonddan Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Blaenrhonddan
Lisa Saycell	Ceredigion County Council Cyngor Sir Ceredigion
Laurence Harding	Pembrokeshire County Council Cyngor Sir Benfro
D Jenkins	Llangyfalach Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Llangyfalach

Merthyr Tydfil
16/ 12/ 2009

23 Attendees

Cllr John Prosser	<i>Abergavenny Town Council Cyngor Tref Y Fenni</i>
Gareth Chapman	<i>Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Merthyr Tudful</i>
Christine Rees	<i>Welsh Assembly Government Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru</i>
Hugh Patrick	<i>Welsh Assembly Government Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru</i>
John Scott	<i>Welsh Assembly Government Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru</i>
Cllr Lindsay Whittle	<i>Leader - Caerphilly County Borough Council Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Caerffili</i>
Cllr Colin P Mann	<i>Deputy Leader - Caerphilly County Borough Council Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Caerffili</i>
Phillip Johnson	<i>Newport City Council Cyngor Dinas Casnewydd</i>
Carol Crowley	<i>Newport City Council Cyngor Dinas Casnewydd</i>

Merthyr Tydfil
(cont.)
16/ 12/ 2009

Cllr D Tucker	<i>Nantyglo & Blaina Town Council Cyngor Tref Nant-y-glo a Blaenau</i>
Mr S Bartlett	<i>Nantyglo & Blaina Town Council Cyngor Tref Nant-y-glo a Blaenau</i>
Sarah Millington	<i>Powys County Council Cyngor Sir Powys</i>
Graham Bartlett	<i>Clerk - Abertillery & Llanhilleth Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Abertyleri a Llanhilledd</i>
Cllr Clive Gravenor	<i>Abertillery & Llanhilleth Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Abertyleri a Llanhilledd</i>
Cllr John Fraser	<i>Penarth Town Council Cyngor Tref Penarth</i>
Cllr Gwyn Roberts	<i>Penarth Town Council Cyngor Tref Penarth</i>
Mrs P Everett	<i>Clerk - New Radnor Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Maesyfed</i>
Cllr M Haines	<i>Chairman New Radnor Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Maesyfed</i>
Cllr Jill Sweet	<i>Porthcawl Town Council Cyngor Tref Porthcawl</i>
Cllr S Aspey	<i>Porthcawl Town Council Cyngor Tref Porthcawl</i>
Cllr Linda Westerman	<i>Henllys Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Henllys</i>
Cllr Evelyn Winfield	<i>Cwmbran Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Cwmbran</i>
Cllr Vic Clayton	<i>Cwmbran Community Council Cyngor Cymuned Cwmbran</i>
Jeremy Patterson	<i>Chief Executive - Powys County Council Cyngor Sir Powys</i>
June Milligan	<i>Welsh Assembly Government Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru</i>
Paul Lucas	



Contact us ...

Comisiwn Ffiniau Llywodraeth Leol i Gymru

Local Government Boundary Commission for Wales

Tŷ Caradog
1 - 6 Plâs Sant Andreas
Caerdydd CF10 3BE

Caradog House
1-6 St Andrews Place
Cardiff CF10 3BE

tel-ffôn: 029 2039 5031
fax-ffacs: 029 2039 5250
e mail - e bost:
cfilll.cymru@cymru.gsi.gov.uk
lgbc.wales@wales.gsi.gov.uk

www.cfilll-cymru.gov.uk
www.lgbc-wales.gov.uk

